DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 025 994 HE 000 210

By-Palola, Ernest G.; And Others

Qualitative Planning: Beyond the Numbers Game.

California Univ., Berkeley. Center for Research and Development in Higher Education.
Pub Date 68
Note-5p.; Article in The Research Reporter; v3 n2 1968
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.35
Descriptors-*Educational Planning, *Faculty, Financial Problems, *Higher Education, Objectives, *Planning, Research, *State Agencies, Universal Education
Identifiers-*Center for Research and Development in Higher Edu

Higher education is facing unprecedented challenge and change in the form of 3 major crises: the "quantitative crisis" of rapid growth induced by a new commitment to universal higher education, the fiscal crisis brought about by greatly increased demands for state and local revenues to support higher education, and the "qualitative crisis" caused by the raising of fundamental questions by students, faculty, legislators and the public about the aims and purposes of higher education. One response to the quantitative and fiscal crises is the establishment of statewide coordinating agencies. Some colleges have responded to the qualitative crisis by instituting ends-oriented planning that includes the examination and determination of all major long-range policies concerning institutional functions and activities. Faculty participation in such planning is crucial. To identify how critical decisions made outside institutions affect their mission and role, a study was made of statewide planning in 4 states and 400 interviews of faculty and administrators active in the planning process were conducted. The extent and reasons for faculty involvement or lack of involvement were examined. Findings suggest that faculty reluctance to participate in planning may continue until: a broader definition of planning is adopted; organizational and professional recognition and encouragement are given to faculty efforts; and planning becomes a more effective instrument for change. The major flaw in planning now is the overemphasis given to means-oriented problems. (JS)

ED025994

QUALITATIVE PLANNING: BEYOND THE NUMBERS GAME

by

Ernest G. Palola
Timothy Lehmann
William R. Blischke

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE000 210

The Research Reporter

The Center for Research and Development in Higher Education

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

Volume III, Number 2, 1968

Qualitative Planning: Beyond the Numbers Game

" . . . We patch here and there, but we still procrastinate about meeting the issues squarely. Only now, years later than it should have happened, do we see a general stirring, a growing sense of urgency among educational leaders regarding the need for clearly establishing the philosophy of their institutions and systematically planning their long-range futures. Only now is there an increasing awareness that, given the rapidly changing world we live in, we can no longer expect anything to remain the same, even educational anythings . . . [Gould, 1968]."

Today higher education faces unprecedented challenge and change. At various times it has been confronted by student demonstrations; fiscal crises; faculty discontent; legislative interference; community uneasiness; rapid social, political, and technological change; domestic tensions; and international conflicts. But probably at no other time has there been simultaneous and intensive impingement of all these forces on higher enducation. We can identify three substantively different but overlapping "crises," which summarize many of these pressures.

THREE MAJOR CRISES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Subsequent to World War II and during the post-Sputnik decade, the primary challenge was a new commitment to universal high education. No longer was access to education beyond high school restricted to a rather well-defined and circumscribed stratum of the populace; instead, an "open door" policy was adopted to provide access to some type of higher education for all qualified students. This meant, obviously, a vast expansion of student enrollments. New institutions were constructed, and existing ones were forced to greatly expand their capacities. Many educators were uneasy about the rate and scope of this expansion since it did not allow for the serious consideration of the long-range impact of this growth on the quality of existing programs and instruction. Nevertheless, expansions occurred, multiversities emerged, and the junior college movement was significantly accelerated. This period of rapid growth and development which began in the late 1950's and early 1960's, and which still persists today, can be referred to as the "quantitative crisis" in higher education.

Although the rate of enrollment expansion has diminished somewhat, we are on the threshold of a new crisis. This crisis involves a dramatic increase in the demands that are being made on state and local treasuries for the support of higher education. Many people believe higher education already is in the midst of a fiscal crisis. State appropriations for higher education continue to grow at fantastic rates. It seems that the extent of the fiscal crisis was not foreseen in its full magnitude when the commitment to universal higher education was made after World War II. However, the implications of the commitment are becoming increasingly evident to all of us in higher education, as well as in local, state, and national governments. For a fuller discussion of these fiscal crises, see *The Public Interest,* Spring 1968.

The third crisis in higher education reflects a substantively different class of pressures impinging on colleges and universities. Students, faculty, legislators, and the general public are, in different ways and to varying degrees, raising fundamental questions about the basic aims and purposes of higher education. To take one example, student activists are raising questions such as: Will the college or university take an activist position and play a leadership role in the analysis, interpretation, and resolution of contemporary social problems of war, poverty, and racial integration? Is it possible for students to play a more fundamental role in the aspects of college life that touch most directly their central concerns--curriculum, teaching, and due process under law? Pressures

such as these for a redefinition of the role of colleges and universities in society might be labeled the "qualitative crisis" in higher education (Palola, 1968). These exigencies may result in more fundamental changes in higher education that those posed by the two other crises mentioned.

RESPONSES TO THE CRISES

One response to the quantitative and fiscal crises is the establishment of statewide coordinating agencies. From the late 1700's to the early 1950's some 18 states developed coordinating bodies. However, the period from 1951 to 1968 saw the creation of an additional 25 such agencies. A major function of these agencies is the development of statewide plans for the orderly growth and development of a state's system of higher educational institutions. Such planning is germane to the issues and problems which the fiscal and quantitative crises have generated; it concerns questions and issues such as: number and type of new institutions, campus size, new programs, costs of instruction, space utilization, average class size, student-faculty ratios, and the like. However, contemporary planning at both the statewide and institutional levels is preoccupied with such problems of logistics almost to the point of excluding serious consideration of qualitative issues. Although this type of planning may not easily capture the attention of faculty, they do share an important stake in means-oriented planning since often decisions about logistics have important implications for educational policy.

A substantively different response to these crises is seen in a few colleges and universities across the nation. In these cases, the reaction is concerned with all three crises mentioned above but particular attention is given to the qualitative crisis through ends-oriented planning. This type of planning includes the examination and determination of all major long-range policies concerning institutional functions and activities. The definition of institutional mission and role can identify the special competencies and inadequacies as well as chart new directions. It is the first and most basic task of planning. This includes the specification of priorities among the multiple ends of educational institutions, as well as the establishment of priorities with regard to such items as: programs and curricula; methods and forms of instruction; recruitment, selection, promotion, and the general welfare of the faculty; admissions criteria, academic standards, and student affairs; and finances and facilities (see chart for a comparison of types of planning).

The faculty role in ends-oriented planning is even more necessary, since this type of planning places special emphasis on educational policy issues. Here, the faculty should be involved, for within their province of expertise are matters such as: the existing strengths and weaknesses in institutional curriculum and programs; subject matter developments and new approaches to teaching in the various disciplines; and the educational soundness and feasibility of proposed modifications to curriculum, programs, and methods of instruction. It is questionable whether the president and other key administrators can provide this type of expertise since they are becoming increasingly preoccupied with external pressures and issues and are thus tending to lose contact with the academic process in their own institutions (Palota, *et al*, 1968).

Some major faculty and other professional associations have recognized that the faculty perspective is necessary to total institutional policy making. One of the most recent statements is presented jointly by the American Association of University Professors, American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Col-

TYPES OF PLANNING

DIMENSIONS	QUANTITATIVE (Means-Oriented)	QUALITATIVE (Ends-Oriented)
1. Scope	Primary concern is the projection of student enrollments to determine budgetary, staff, and facilities needs.	*All* major policies are examined and determined about institutional functions and activities (i.e., institutional mission and role, programs, curricula, methods and forms of instruction; recruitment, selection, promotion, and general welfare of the faculty; admissions criteria, academic standards, and student affairs; finances and facilities).
2. Priority	Priorities are usually set for expansions of staff and facilities only.	Institutional mission and role is defined so that the special competencies and inadequacies are identified and priorities are established among the goals of the institution.
3. Style	*Periodic* and usually reactive to *crisis* situations or external demands.	*Continuous* planning and adaptation to new conditions and commitments.
4. Research	Data are utilized but in a limited, piecemeal, and unsystematic way.	A continuous process of *research* occurs which focuses on the key issues facing the institution and which goes beyond the routine service of institutional research offices.
5. Participants	Restricted usually to administrators who may make decisions with limited consultation of others.	Faculty, students, administrators, and trustees all *Share* responsibility for planning. Each group has a unique perspective, type of expertise and particular contribution to make toward planning.
6. Participation	When faculty are involved their role is to *react* to plans written by administrators. Generally, faculty and student involvement is minimal since planning is seen as an administrative task and no special incentives are provided for participation.	Planning involves both initiator and reactor roles played by the above groups at different times in the planning process. Special incentives - released time, staff, funds - increase the quality of such participation.
7. Structure	The *existing* organizational machinery is used and it is geared to routine, day-to-day issues that focus on limited sectors of the total institution.	Planning requires a *special structure* and a *joint* steering committee to provide an institutional perspective and to focus on generic issues facing the institution.
8. Implementation	Plans are implemented in a routine and unsystematic way, often without assessing the political context of the institution.	A time-table and a general strategy are specified by which proposals will be put into action. Such a strategy considers vested interests within the institution for successful implementation.

leges (1966). They state that the multiplicity of factors and dimensions which permeate the various tasks performed by institutions necessitates the *full opportunity for joint planning* among governing boards, administrators, faculty, students, and others. And, the *faculty should have primary responsibility* for curriculum, methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those portions of student life which relate directly to the educational process.

In this paper, we examine the relative prevalence and characteristrics of means- versus ends-oriented planning at several colleges and universities, show the extent of involvement by faculty in planning, and identify the reasons for faculty involvement or their reluctance to participate in planning.

A STUDY OF PLANNING IN HIGHER EDUCATION

The Center for Research and Development in Higher Education has recently conducted a study of statewide planning and its institutional effects in four states--California, Florida, Illinois, and New York. The major thrust of this study was to identify how critical decisions made outside institutions affect their mission and role. Considerable data were collected through interviews and documents about institutional planning within a sample of 80 colleges and universities. These institutions included public and private universities, state colleges, and junior or community colleges. At each institution, from eight to ten interviews were conducted with the faculty and administrators who played key roles in the planning process. The interviewees typically included: president, academic vice president, vice president for financial affairs, deans of schools or colleges, chairman of the faculty, and chairman and members of special or existing committees responsible for planning. In semistructured interviews, respondents were asked about: present and past planning activities, the rationale for planning, the arrangements by which plans were or are being implemented, the basic questions or issues around which planning is organized, and the attitudes held by faculty and adminstrators about planning. Approximately 400 interviews were conducted at these institutions. The major current planning and organizational documents were also collected at each campus. Since, in addition to other purposes, the documents also served a public relations function, we tended to rely most heavily on the interview data. In effect, then, the overall institutional characterizations resulted from a complex and, to some extent, subjective, task of reducing the data to a generalized portrait of the type of planning engaged in at each institution. Only a small portion of the data collected are summarized here. A fuller report is in progress and should be available in early 1969.

GENERAL FINDINGS

At the general level, the data show that all institutions have used some form of planning in the past. The planning activity of the great majority, however, can be characterized as: periodic rather than continuous, preoccupied with growth and financial issues, initiated and performed primarily by administrators, based on limited research, lacking integration in decisions regarding academic matters, facilities, and budgetary issues, concerned with the overall development of all academic and nonacademic units, and motivated by pressures external to the institution, for example, coordinating boards and state government offices.

The process of developing plans and the participation in planning by faculty and administrators can be characterized along three dimensions: whether a special (long-range planning committee) or existing (curriculum or educational policy committee) structure is primarily used; whether a joint (faculty *and* administrators) or separate structure (faculty *or* administrators) is primarily employed; and whether the amount of faculty participation in planning is classified as active or light. The level of faculty participation in planning was based on a comparative qualitative judgment of factors such as the number of faculty involved, the types of committees utilized, the amount of faculty time invested, and whether the faculty played an initiating or reacting role in the process. An institution classified as having *light* participation has no special structure which brings together all participants, involves only a limited number of faculty, and involves them primarily on a reactive basis.

The data show that the planning presently underway is accomplished primarily (in 51 out of 80 institutions) through the *existing* committee structures. But these existing structures may or may not join faculty and administrators on the same committee. In fact, most colleges and universities (44 out of 80 institutions) *separate* faculty from administrators, whether in existing or special committees. A joint structure is more often used in public than private institutions (56% versus 39%). And, finally, participation by faculty is *light* at 48 of the 80 institutions. These findings suggest, first, that planning very often receives secondary treatment in preference to day-to-day operational matters and is limited to a short-range perspective since it is generally accomplished through the regular committee structure. Second, the planning efforts of faculty and administrators lack coordination, since planning usually takes place in two separate committees. And third, faculty participation in planning is generally limited to a small cadre, and their contribution is mainly reactive rather than initiative or leading.

Reasons For Faculty Involvement

The reasons for faculty involvement were elicited from both faculty members and administrators. There was a surprising similarity in the perspectives of both groups, which was probably a result of the selective self-recruitment and organizational recruitment of the faculty who played an active role in planning. The following reasons for faculty involvement in planning were cited as major by at least one faculty member or administrator at the number of institutions indicated: the administration encourages participation (49), the campus is new or is changing its mission and role (24), and the external system fosters participation (22). The key point of these findings is that all the reasons cited derive from administrative-institutional issues or from pressures on institutions by agencies in the larger state system for higher education. According to interviewees, faculty generally are not motivated to participate out of a belief in the importance of planning to their institution or a belief that planning might improve teaching and research. This is developed further in the discussion of ends-oriented planning.

Reasons For Faculty Reluctance

Although substantial arguments can be made for faculty participation in planning, as just suggested, in fact, faculty may be reluctant to participate in planning to the fullest extent desirable, or even to participate at all. There are several critical reasons: First, one man can wear only so many hats. The enlargement of institutions means a corresponding increase in committees and the number of varied tasks each person is asked to perform. Second, the urgency of immediate and pending issues drives out a concern for long-range problems. Crises of the day - - collective bargaining, faculty tenure, student demands - - are uppermost in the minds of many faculty. Third, the system of rewards and incentives, especially in universities, encourages (almost compels) faculty to spend their time on scholarly activities. The oft-mentioned statement that promotion depends on scholarly productivity carries special significance here. And, fourth, the type of planning which places primary emphasis on quantitative matters and problems of logistics rather than on fundamental questions of educational policy holds little attraction for the faculty. Given these factors and others, it is not surprising that faculty are reluctant to participate actively in instiutional planning.

The following reasons for faculty reluctance to participate were cited by at least one faculty member or administrator at the number of institutions indicated: planning is an administrative task (49); faculty are preoccupied with faculty-administrative and faculty conflicts (44); faculty are oriented to their disciplines (38); faculty are impractical, inexperienced, and lack institutionwide perspective (31); and the external system hinders planning (25). These findings identify most of the different institutional and professional constraints on faculty participation and they point to a fundamental issue: *planning is often not considered a legitimate part of the faculty role by administrators and faculty.* This interpretation is characterized in the following statement by a planning-oriented faculty member about his colleagues' attitudes:

> . . . the faculty are the greatest drag on academic planning and innovation in the university. They are quite traditional in their views of instruction and majors and do not think ahead. Faculty do plan carefully for their research work but not for their teaching. This is an interesting paradox. The typical faculty member does not plan but operates on a muddling through basis. He reacts to crises. He is problem oriented and operates with a one or two year perspective when it comes to teaching . . . The values system is such as to inhibit planning. There is a double standard and ambivalence as to who should plan. The faculty attitude seems to be why doesn't someone else do it right. Faculty do not wish to be bothered; yet they gripe when things go wrong. There is great interest expressed in academic planning but faculty are unwilling to accept the responsibility.

Although most of the public and private institutions in our sample of 80 campuses practiced means-oriented planning, 20 were classified as having ends-oriented planning. These institutions differed from the quantitatively oriented institutions in that at only 50 percent of the 20 ends-oriented institutions was planning seen by at least one interviewee as an administrative task. In contrast, planning was more likely (39 out of 60 institutions) to be seen at least one faculty member or administrator at quantitatively oriented instituitons as an administrative task since it was basically concerned with enrollment projections, staffing ratios, and fiscal matters. Furthermore, in institutions engaged in qualitative planning, the faculty are seen as inexperienced and impractical participants in only 14 percent of the institutions. On the other hand, interviewees (faculty and administrators) in 47 percent of the quantitative institutions characterized faculty participants in this way. In orther words, faculty are seen as less useful contributors when planning is designed to cope with enrollment expansion and efficient use of resources. However, when questions of educational policy and assessment are at stake, the faculty are seen as important participants and are more likely to view their participation positively.

Another interesting contrast between means- and ends-oriented institutions is that organizational conflicts were more frequently cited as a reason for lack of faculty involvement at the means-oriented planning institutions (62% as compared to 33%). One explanation of this might be that the planning process itself at goal-oriented institutions increases commitment to the institution and generally raises morale of the participants. These data about the role of facutly in current institutional planning support the earlier suggestion that faculty are reluctant planners when the type of planning is based primarily on means-oriented problems.

CONCLUSIONS

These findings and interpretations suggest that faculty reluctance to participate in planning may continue until: 1) a broader definition of planning is adopted by both administrators and faculty such that qualitative, goal-oriented issues become the first order of business, followed closely by and integrated systematically with physical, fiscal, and demographic factors of institutional expansion; 2) organizational and professional recognition and encouragement are given to faculty for their participation in planning; and 3) planning becomes a more central and effective instrument for change within higher educa ion.

Thus, the major flaw at this time in higher education planning is the overemphasis given to means-oriented problems. This emphasis must shift, not only because of the growing significance of the qualitative crisis but because the quantitative crisis and fiscal pressures will ultimately require careful definition of institutional mission and role.

—ERNEST G. PALOLA
—TIMOTHY LEHMANN
—WILLIAM R. BLISCHKE

REFERENCES

American Association of University Professors, American Council on Education, & Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. Statement on government of colleges and universities. *AAUP Bulletin,* Winter 1966, 3-14.

Gould, Samuel P. In *A plan of action.* Albany, New York: Office of Long-range Planning, State University of New York, 1968.

Palola, E. G. *Changing centers of power in education: A challenge to institutional leadership.* Berkeley, California: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, 1968.

Palola, E. G., Lehmann, T., & Blischke, W. R. The reluctant planner: The role of faculty in institutional planning. In *Association for Institutional Research Annual Proceedings,* 1968.

The Public Interest, Spring 1968.